

ITP-SB-93-32

IP-ASTP-20-93

May, 1993

Direct CP Violation in $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ **Hai-Yang Cheng**

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica
 Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China
 and

Institute for Theoretical Physics, State University of New York
 Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA

Abstract

CP violation due to interference between K_L and K_S decays into $\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is analyzed in the Standard Model. The CP-violating parameter $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$, which is the difference between $\eta_{+-\gamma}$ and η_{+-} , receives dominant contributions from $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing and the gluon penguin diagram; its magnitude is calculated to be $10^{-2}\epsilon$ at a typical region of the Dalitz plot. Genuine direct CP violation in $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ decay originating from the electromagnetic penguin diagram is of order $10^{-4}\epsilon$.

Recently, interference between K_L and K_S into the final state $\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ has been observed for the first time in experiment 731 at Fermilab [1]. A new CP-violating parameter $\eta_{+-\gamma}$ to be defined later is extracted from this experiment to be $(2.15 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-3}$ in magnitude and $(72 \pm 23 \pm 17)^\circ$ in phase angle. Writing $\eta_{+-\gamma} = \eta_{+-} + \epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ and using the known value of η_{+-} measured from $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decay, a limit on the parameter $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ in the decay mode $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is obtained: $|\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}|/\epsilon < 0.3$. The purpose of this Letter is to study the theoretical expectation of $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ in the Standard Model.

The radiative decays $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ receive two distinct contributions: inner bremsstrahlung (IB) and direct emission (DE). Under Lorentz and gauge invariance, the general expression for the decay $K(k) \rightarrow \pi(p_1)\pi(p_2)\gamma(q, \epsilon)$ reads

$$A(K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma) = A_{\text{IB}} + A_{\text{DE}}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$A_{\text{IB}} = \mathcal{A}e \left(\frac{p_1 \cdot \epsilon}{p_1 \cdot q} - \frac{p_2 \cdot \epsilon}{p_2 \cdot q} \right), \quad (2)$$

$$A_{\text{DE}} = \mathcal{B}[ie\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}p_1^\mu p_2^\nu q^\rho \epsilon^\sigma] + \mathcal{C}e[(p_1 \cdot \epsilon)(p_2 \cdot q) - (p_2 \cdot \epsilon)(p_1 \cdot q)]. \quad (3)$$

The first term in A_{DE} is caused by a pure magnetic transition, while the second term corresponds to an electric transition. The coefficients $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are in general momentum dependent. In the leading multipole expansion, $\mathcal{B}$ corresponds to a magnetic dipole (M1) transition, whereas $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{C}$ to electric dipole (E1) transitions. From chiral perturbation theory (ChPT) point of view, DE amplitudes are of most interest because they provide an ideal place to test higher-order weak chiral Lagrangians. In ChPT, the DE radiative decay $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ cannot be generated from the lowest order p^2 chiral Lagrangian because Lorentz and gauge invariance requires at least three powers of momenta in the amplitude.

The most general p^4 CP-invariant $\Delta S = 1$ non-anomalous electroweak chiral Lagrangian with one external photon field which satisfies the constraints of chiral and CPS symmetry

¹ has the expression [3]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1} = i \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e F^{\mu\nu} [\omega_1 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu Q) + \omega_2 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu Q L_\mu)] \quad (4)$$

for normal intrinsic parity transitions, while anomalous Lagrangian terms for the odd intrinsic parity sector are [4]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1} &= ia \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(Q L_\mu) \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu) \\ &+ ib \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(Q U^\dagger L_\mu U) \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu) \\ &+ ic \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 [U Q U^\dagger, L_\mu L_\nu]), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta}$, $Q = \text{diag}(\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3})$, $L_\mu \equiv (D_\mu U) U^\dagger$ with $D_\mu U = \partial_\mu U - ie A_\mu [Q, U]$ is an $SU(3)_R$ singlet, and

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \exp \left(2i \frac{\phi}{f_\pi} \right), \quad f_\pi = 132 \text{ MeV}, \\ \phi &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \phi^a \lambda^a = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \eta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In Eqs.(4) and (5), g_8 is the octet weak coupling constant appearing in the lowest order CP-invariant $\Delta S = 1$ weak chiral Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_W^{(2)} = -g_8 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L^\mu). \quad (7)$$

Presently, there is only one experimental information on the coupling constants appearing in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$. From the BNL measurement of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ e^+ e^-$ decay rate [5], one finds a scale-independent result

$$\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 - 12L_9 \simeq -7.5 \times 10^{-3}, \quad (8)$$

where L_9 is one of the coupling constants in the p^4 strong-interaction chiral Lagrangian coupled to the external vector and axial-vector gauge fields [6]. When combining with the empirical value of $L_9 = 6.7 \times 10^{-3}$ at the renormalization scale $\mu = m_\rho$ [6], this leads to

$$\omega_1^r(\mu = m_\rho) + 2\omega_2^r(\mu = m_\rho) \simeq 0.074, \quad (9)$$

¹ CPS is a discrete symmetry which is the product of ordinary CP with a switching symmetry S , which switches the d - and s -quark fields; see Ref.[2].

where the superscript r means renormalized coupling constant.

In principle, the unknown coupling constants ω_1 , ω_2 , a , b and c should be determined from various low-energy hadronic processes. However, in the limit of large N_c (N_c being the number of quark color degrees of freedom), these couplings become theoretically manageable at least to the zeroth order of α_s [4]. This is based on bosonization, factorization, and the $\Delta S = 1$ effective weak Hamiltonian at the quark level. It is found that in the large- N_c approach ²

$$\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 4L_9 = \frac{N_c}{12\pi^2}, \quad (10)$$

and

$$a = 2b = 4c = \frac{N_c}{12\pi^2}. \quad (11)$$

The result (11) first obtained in Ref.[4] was recently confirmed by Ref.[7]. Several remarks are in order: (i) The couplings a , b and c are determined by chiral anomalies and hence are free of gluonic corrections. (ii) It was pointed out in Ref.[3] that the relation $\omega_2 = 4L_9$ must hold at least for the divergent parts of the counterterm coupling constants because they must render the divergent loop amplitudes finite. Evidently, this relation is preserved in the large- N_c approach. (iii) The large- N_c prediction $\omega + 2\omega_2 = 0.076$ is in remarkable agreement with (9), though the latter is renormalization scale dependent. The scale-indepenent prediction $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 - 12L_9 = 0$ is also in good agreement with (8) in view of the fact that $12L_9(\mu = m_\rho) \simeq 0.08$.

At the p^4 level, there are two different contributions to direct emission of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$: contact-term contributions induced by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$, and the long-distance pole contributions generated by the weak $K - \pi$ transition and the anomalous $\pi\pi\pi\gamma$ interaction governed by the anomalous Wess-Zumino-Witten term [9]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{WZW}} = -\frac{N_c}{3\pi^2 f_\pi^3} e\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} A_\mu \text{Tr}(Q\partial_\nu\phi\partial_\alpha\phi\partial_\beta\phi) + \dots \quad (12)$$

We now focus on the decays $K_{L,S} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$. For reasons to be explained later, the ω_1 term in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ does not contribute to any radiative decays of $K_{L,S}$ with a real photon emission.

²A different large- N_c prediction $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 8L_9$ is obtained in Ref.[8].

In the limit of CP symmetry, the ω_2 term does not contribute to $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$, whereas $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ makes no contribution to $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ (see Ref.[4] for details). We thus see that if CP is good, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is a pure M1 transition, while $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is caused by electric transitions. Unfortunately, one cannot make a definite prediction for the direct emission of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ despite the fact that it is originated from chiral anomalies. This is because the π^0 and η pole contributions cancel each other due to the Gell-Mann-Okubo mass relation $m_\eta^2 = \frac{1}{3}(4m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)$, a phenomenon also known to the decay $K_L \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ (for a review, see Ref.[10]). Therefore, contrary to the common belief,³ the direct emission of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ at the p^4 level is solely determined by the anomalous contact term $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ and has a branching ratio⁴ of 2×10^{-4} , which is too large by an order of magnitude when compared with the recent experimental value of $(3.19 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-5}$ measured in E731 experiment at Fermilab [11]. This implies that a *large* and *destructive* p^6 contribution is called for in order to accommodate data. At order $\mathcal{O}(p^6)$, several effects should be taken into consideration: SU(3) breaking, $\eta - \eta'$ mixing,⁵ momentum dependence of vertices, and higher order anomalous Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$. In the absence of knowledge of the p^6 Lagrangians, no reliable prediction on the direct emission of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ can be made at present.

In the presence of CP violation, K_L is allowed to have an E1 transition into the final state $\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$. Possible CP-violating effects in $\pi\pi\gamma$ decay of neutral kaons have been studied by many authors [14,15]. Some effects such as asymmetry between π^+ and π^- spectra, photon polarization, require going beyond the dipole approximation and are expected to be small. At the leading dipole level, CP nonconservation can be observed through the $K_L - K_S$

³The DE amplitude of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is widely assumed to be dominated by pseudoscalar meson poles in the literature; needlessly to say, this assumption has no ground in ChPT.

⁴This number is obtained from Eqs.(4.21) and (4.11) of Ref.[4]. Since we are working in the leading order in $1/N_c$ expansion, chiral loops can be neglected.

⁵The SU(3)-singlet η' is integrated out in ChPT, but its effect on $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ will manifest in the coefficients of higher order Lagrangian terms. In practice, the pole amplitude is evaluated at the p^4 level by explicitly incorporating the η' pole. Theoretical uncertainties include SU(3) breaking in the decay constants f_η , $f_{\eta'}$ and in the matrix element $\langle \eta | \mathcal{L}_W | K \rangle$ [12], $\eta - \eta'$ mixing angle, and nonet-symmetry breaking in the matrix element $\langle \eta' | \mathcal{L}_W | K \rangle$ [13].

interference [15]. It is natural to consider the CP-violating parameter

$$\eta_{+-\gamma} = \frac{A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)}. \quad (13)$$

Note that M1 transitions do not play a role here. Since $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ decay is predominated by IB, as will be shown later, and since IB amplitudes have the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma)_{\text{IB}} &= -eA(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \left(\frac{p_+ \cdot \epsilon}{p_+ \cdot q} - \frac{p_- \cdot \epsilon}{p_- \cdot q} \right), \\ A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma)_{\text{IB}} &= -eA(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \left(\frac{p_+ \cdot \epsilon}{p_+ \cdot q} - \frac{p_- \cdot \epsilon}{p_- \cdot q} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

we are led to

$$\eta_{+-\gamma} = \eta_{+-} + \epsilon'_{+-\gamma} = \eta_{+-} + \frac{A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\eta_{+-} = A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)/A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \epsilon + \epsilon'$ characterizes CP noninvariance in $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decay. Because in the convention of ChPT, $|K_{1,2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K^0\rangle \pm |\bar{K}^0\rangle)$, we write the wave functions of $K_{L,S}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |K_L\rangle &= \frac{(1+\bar{\epsilon})|K^0\rangle + (1-\bar{\epsilon})|\bar{K}^0\rangle}{\sqrt{2(1+|\bar{\epsilon}|^2)}} = \frac{|K_2\rangle + \bar{\epsilon}|K_1\rangle}{\sqrt{1+|\bar{\epsilon}|^2}}, \\ |K_S\rangle &= \frac{(1+\bar{\epsilon})|K^0\rangle - (1-\bar{\epsilon})|\bar{K}^0\rangle}{\sqrt{2(1+|\bar{\epsilon}|^2)}} = \frac{|K_1\rangle + \bar{\epsilon}|K_2\rangle}{\sqrt{1+|\bar{\epsilon}|^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the parameter $\bar{\epsilon}$ (though not physical) measures the amount of CP violation in the neutral kaon wave functions. It follows from Eq.(15) that

$$\epsilon'_{+-\gamma} = \frac{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}} \left(\bar{\epsilon} + \frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}} \right). \quad (17)$$

As $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ does receive contributions from CP nonconservation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, it is not a pure “direct” CP-violating effect. We will come back to this point later.

Even at this stage, we can make a crude estimate on the magnitude of $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ simply based on the experimental observation of the decay rates of IB and DE in K_L and/or K^+ . First of all, the two terms in the parentheses of Eq.(17) are of order ϵ . Second, the DE rate is naively expected to be suppressed relative to that of IB. However, IB of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is subject to CP violation as can be seen from Eq.(14). Likewise, the IB amplitude of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\gamma$

is a $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ transition and is thus suppressed by a factor of $A(K_S \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))/A(K_S \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=2)) \cong 22$. Consequently, the DE rates in the $\pi\pi\gamma$ decays of K_L and K^+ are not very small compared to that of IB, and they even dominate in the K_L case. This explains why structure-dependent DE effects can be practically seen in the radiative decays of K_L and $K^\pm$. Experimentally [11,16],

$$\begin{aligned} Br(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma)_{\text{IB}} &= (1.49 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-5}, \\ Br(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma)_{\text{DE}} &= (3.19 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-5}, \\ Br(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\gamma)_{\text{tot}} &= (2.75 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-4}, \\ Br(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\gamma)_{\text{DE}} &= (1.8 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\gamma$ has a larger IB rate because the $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ suppression is less severe than the corresponding CP-violation one in the counterpart of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$. For $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ decay, its IB amplitude is no longer subject to CP violation or $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ suppression. As a consequence, this decay mode is totally dominated by the IB mechanism. Although the ratio of $A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}/A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}$ depends on the region of the Dalitz plot, we see from Eq.(18) that it is roughly of order 10^{-2} after taking into account the suppression factor for IB amplitudes in K_L and $K^\pm$ decays. We thus have $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma} \sim 10^{-2}\epsilon$, which is in accordance with more accurate calculations presented below.

In the Standard Model, there exist two different contributions of amplitude CP violation to the DE amplitude of $K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$: one from the gluon-penguin diagram, and the other from the loop $s \rightarrow d\gamma$ diagram (so-called electromagnetic penguin diagram); that is,

$$A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}} = A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{gluon}} + A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{em}}. \tag{19}$$

We first focus on the gluon-penguin diagram. The lowest order CP-odd $\Delta S = 1$ weak Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L}_W^- = -ig'_8 \text{Tr}(\lambda_7 L_\mu L^\mu). \tag{20}$$

The Gell-Mann matrix λ_7 ensures that the decay $K_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi$ is allowed by $\mathcal{L}_W^-$, but not $K_1 \rightarrow \pi\pi$. Unlike the CP-even octet coupling constant g_8 , the CP-odd one g'_8 presumably

only receives contributions from the short-distance QCD penguin diagram. The CP-odd $\Delta S = 1$ effective Hamiltonian induced by the gluon penguin diagram has the structure ⁶

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{peng}}^- = i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=u,c,t} \text{Im}(V_{is}^* V_{id}) I_i (Q_2 - Q_1 - h.c.), \quad (21)$$

where $Q_1 = (\bar{s}d)(\bar{u}u)$, $Q_2 = (\bar{s}u)(\bar{u}d)$, with $(\bar{q}_i q_j) \equiv \bar{q}_i \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_j$. Since the bosonization of the quark current $(\bar{q}_i q_j)$ is $\frac{i}{2} f_\pi^2 (L_\mu)_{ji}$ (see Eq.(3.13) of Ref.[4] for higher order corrections), it follows that the leading-order chiral representation of $(Q_2 - Q_1 - h.c.)$ is equivalent to $(f_\pi^2/4\pi) \text{Tr}(\lambda_7 L_\mu L^\mu)$. The coupling constant g'_8 is related to $\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum \text{Im}(V_{is}^* V_{id}) I_i$, but it turns out that we do not have to know the exact expression of the penguin coefficients I_i . The argument goes as follows. Starting from Eq.(21) and following the prescription in Ref.[4] for the derivation of large- N_c p^4 electroweak chiral Lagrangians, it is easily seen that the relevant CP-odd p^4 Lagrangians have the same structure as the CP-even ones $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ given before except for the replacement of g_8 by ig'_8 and the Gell-Mann matrix λ_6 by λ_7 . For example, the CP-odd p^4 non-anomalous terms can be read directly from Eq.(4) as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^- = - \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g'_8 e F^{\mu\nu} [\omega_1 \text{Tr}(\lambda_7 L_\mu L_\nu Q) + \omega_2 \text{Tr}(\lambda_7 L_\nu Q L_\mu)]. \quad (22)$$

It follows from Eqs.(4) and (22) that

$$\frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{gluon}}}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}}} = i \frac{g'_8}{g_8}. \quad (23)$$

However, from Eqs.(7) and (20) we obtain

$$\frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))} = i \frac{g'_8}{g_8}. \quad (24)$$

This together with (23) leads to

$$\frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{gluon}}}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}}} = \frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))} = \frac{A_0 - A_0^*}{A_0 + A_0^*} = i \frac{\text{Im} A_0}{\text{Re} A_0}, \quad (25)$$

where $A_0 \equiv A(K^0 \rightarrow \pi\pi(I=0))$ and use of $CP|\bar{K}^0\rangle = -|K^0\rangle$ has been made. This, when combining with $\bar{\epsilon}$, gives rise to precisely the well-known CP-violating parameter ϵ [18]

$$\epsilon \cong \bar{\epsilon} + i \frac{\text{Im} A_0}{\text{Re} A_0}. \quad (26)$$

⁶To the first order in chiral expansion, the penguin operator Q_6 is equivalent to $-4(Q_2 - Q_1)v^2/\Lambda_\chi^2$ [17], where v characterizes the quark order parameter $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, and $\Lambda_\chi \sim 1$ GeV is a chiral-symmetry breaking scale.

This result has the desired feature: Neither $\bar{\epsilon}$ nor $i\text{Im}A_0/\text{Re}A_0$ is rephasing invariant, but their combination is a physical quantity. For example, consider a phase redefinition of the s quark field, $s \rightarrow se^{i\alpha}$. It follows $|K^0 \rangle \rightarrow |K^0 \rangle e^{-i\alpha}$, $|\bar{K}^0 \rangle \rightarrow |\bar{K}^0 \rangle e^{i\alpha}$. Recasting ϵ into the form [18]

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\theta} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{Im}M_{12}}{\text{Re}M_{12}} + \frac{\text{Im}A_0}{\text{Re}A_0} \right), \quad \theta = \tan^{-1} \frac{2\Delta M}{\Gamma_S} \simeq 45^\circ, \quad (27)$$

with $M_{12} = \langle K^0 | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=2} | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$ being the neutral kaon mass matrix element, we see that ϵ is rephasing invariant as $\text{Im}M_{12}/\text{Re}M_{12} \rightarrow (\text{Im}M_{12}/\text{Re}M_{12} + 2\alpha)$ and $\text{Im}A_0/\text{Re}A_0 \rightarrow (\text{Im}A_0/\text{Re}A_0 - \alpha)$ under infinitesimal phase transformation.

Up to now, we have

$$\epsilon'_{+-\gamma} = \frac{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}} \left(\epsilon + \frac{A(K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{sm}}}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}} \right). \quad (28)$$

Genuine direct CP violation (i.e. amplitude CP violation) comes from the second term in $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ originating from the loop $s \rightarrow d\gamma$ transition. The corresponding Lagrangian is given by [19]

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{EM}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{e}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i=u,c,t} V_{is}^* V_{id} \{ c_7(x_i) Q_7 + F(x_i) Q_T \} + h.c., \quad (29)$$

where $x_i = m_i^2/M_W^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_7 &= \bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu}, \\ Q_T &= i[m_s \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)d + m_d \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 + \gamma_5)d] F^{\mu\nu}, \\ F(x) &= \frac{(8x^2 + 5x - 7)x}{12(x - 1)^3} - \frac{(3x - 2)x^2}{2(x - 1)^4} \ln x. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Since the chiral realization of $\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d$ is proportional to $(L_\mu)_{23}$, it is straightforward to show that the chiral representation of $\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu}$ is exactly the ω_1 term in Eq.(4) [3]. Of course, besides the short-distance $s \rightarrow d\gamma$ effect, the coefficient ω_1 also receives long-distance contributions. However, the fact that $\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = 0$ for a real photon emission suffices to lead us to conclude that, as was promised before, the ω_1 term $\text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu Q) F^{\mu\nu}$ does not contribute to any radiative decays of neutral kaons with one on-shell photon, as can be explicitly checked.

The tensor operator Q_T -induced DE amplitude of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is given by

$$A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{em}} = iG_F \frac{e}{16\pi^2} \text{Im}(V_{ts}^* V_{td}) F(x_t) \langle \pi^+\pi^-\gamma | Q_T | K^0 \rangle, \quad (31)$$

where $F(x_i)$ is obviously dominated by the top quark. Note that the matrix element $\langle \pi^+\pi^- | \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 d | K^0 \rangle$ is related to $\langle \pi^+\pi^- | \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} d | K^0 \rangle$ through the identity

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 = -\frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (32)$$

Therefore, the general expression for the matrix element of the tensor operator Q_T reads

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi^+\pi^-\gamma | Q_T | K^0 \rangle &\cong 2m_s \epsilon^\mu q^\nu \langle \pi^+\pi^- | \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)d | K^0 \rangle \\ &= \beta[(p_+ \cdot \epsilon)(p_- \cdot q) - (p_- \cdot \epsilon)(p_+ \cdot q) - i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}p_+^\mu p_-^\nu q^\rho \epsilon^\sigma]. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Our task is to evaluate the coefficient β . It is interesting to note that the $K^0 \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude induced by the operator $\tilde{Q}_T = [\bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)d + h.c.]$ also occurs in the Weinberg model of CP violation in which three Higgs doublets are introduced to generate CP nonconservation via Higgs exchange [20]. Previously, this amplitude is evaluated through the use of current algebra and the bag-model calculation of the $K - \pi$ transition, but it is subject to large theoretical uncertainties (for a review, see Ref.[21]). Here we will follow Ref.[22] to use the chiral language to get an estimate of the coefficient β .

The lowest order chiral realization of $\tilde{Q}_T$ is $\text{Tr}(\lambda_6 U)$. One may be tempted to think that β is thus fixed in this way. However, this is not the case. The reason is being that an additional tadpole diagram arising from the strong $K\pi \rightarrow K\pi$ scattering followed by a $K \rightarrow$ vacuum weak transition should be included [23,21], and it exactly compensates the direct $K^0 \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude induced by $\tilde{Q}_T$. The vanishing $\tilde{Q}_T$ -generated $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ amplitude to the lowest order in chiral symmetry also can be understood from the chiral point of view of Q_T . As pointed out in Ref.[22], in order to write down its chiral representation one needs at least three U matrices to get two derivatives to match with $F_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, the CP-violating $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ decay induced by the $s \rightarrow d\gamma$ mechanism is necessary of higher order chiral effect.

The chiral structure of O_T is not the same as $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ since it vanishes in

the chiral limit. Among many possible realizations, a typical one for E1 transitions is [22]⁷

$$\mathcal{O}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_T \sim \gamma F^{\mu\nu} \left(M \partial_\mu U [Q, U^\dagger] \partial_\nu U + \partial_\mu U^\dagger [Q, U] \partial_\nu U^\dagger M \right)_{23}, \quad (34)$$

with $M = \text{diag}(m_u, m_d, m_s)$. There are of course other chiral terms for M1 transitions, but as noted in passing, the M1 amplitude is related to the E1 one through Eq.(33). The coefficient γ is estimated by naive dimensional analysis to be f_π .⁸ For our purpose of estimation, it suffices to apply (34) to fix the parameter β . We find

$$\langle \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma | \mathcal{O}_T | K^0 \rangle_{\text{DE}} \simeq -\frac{8}{f_\pi^3} \gamma m_s [(p_+ \cdot \epsilon)(p_- \cdot q) - (p_- \cdot \epsilon)(p_+ \cdot q)], \quad (35)$$

and hence

$$\beta \sim -\frac{8}{f_\pi^2} m_s. \quad (36)$$

Note that the same result is obtained by working out the higher order realization of the operator $\tilde{Q}_T$. In the Chau-Keung parametrization of the quark-mixing matrix [25],

$$\text{Im}(V_{ts}^* V_{td}) \simeq s_{13} s_{23} \sin \delta_{13}, \quad (37)$$

where we have adopted the notation of the Particle Data Group [16]. Putting everything together, we get

$$A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{em}} = -i \frac{G_F m_s}{2\pi^2 f_\pi^2} (s_{13} s_{23} \sin \delta_{13}) F(x_t) e[(p_+ \cdot \epsilon)(p_- \cdot q) - (p_- \cdot \epsilon)(p_+ \cdot q)]. \quad (38)$$

As for the DE amplitude of $K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$, we obtain from Eqs.(4) and (10) that (see also Eq.(4.21) of Ref.[4])

$$A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}} = -\frac{8g_8}{\sqrt{2}\pi^2 f_\pi^5} e[(p_+ \cdot \epsilon)(p_- \cdot q) - (p_- \cdot \epsilon)(p_+ \cdot q)]. \quad (39)$$

Numerically, we thus have⁹

$$\frac{A(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}^{\text{em}}}{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}} = -i 4.3 \times 10^{-5} \sin \delta_{13}, \quad (40)$$

⁷The charge matrix Q given in Ref.[22] is $\text{diag}(1, 0, 0)$. We use this chance to point out that a crucial factor of $(1/4\pi)$ is likely missing in Eq.(15) of Ref.[22]. Consequently, CP-violating asymmetry for $K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \pi^0$ and $K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \pi^0 \gamma$ is overestimated there by a factor of $(4\pi)^2$.

⁸There are several slightly different versions of naive dimensional analysis; we use the updated one [24]. Note that the sign of the coefficient γ or β is not fixed by this method.

⁹This ratio is rephasing invariant, though $\text{Im}(V_{ts}^* V_{td})$ by itself is not.

where uses have been made of $m_s = 175$ MeV, $s_{23} = 0.044$, $s_{13}/s_{23} = 0.1$, $F(x_t) = 0.34$ for $m_t = 150$ GeV, and the experimental value [26]

$$g_8 = -0.26 \times 10^{-8} m_K^2. \quad (41)$$

Finally, we need to know the ratio of $A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}/A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}$, which is obtained from Eqs.(14) and (39) to be

$$\frac{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}} = \frac{4\sqrt{2}g_8}{\pi^2 f_\pi^5 A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)} (p_+ \cdot q)(p_- \cdot q). \quad (42)$$

In principle, this ratio and hence $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ is maximized at the region of the Dalitz plot where the photon has its highest energy. However, we instead choose a typical Dalitz point, say $E_\gamma = 90$ MeV, to get a more realistic estimate of $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$. A simple calculation gives

$$(p_+ \cdot q)(p_- \cdot q) = 4.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^4 \quad \text{at } E_\gamma = 90 \text{ MeV}. \quad (43)$$

This together with the experimental value [26]

$$A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = 3.88 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}, \quad (44)$$

and Eqs.(42), (43) yields

$$\left. \frac{A(K_1 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{DE}}}{A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma, E1)_{\text{IB}}} \right|_{E_\gamma=90 \text{ MeV}} = -1.1 \times 10^{-2}. \quad (45)$$

By virtue of Eqs.(28), (40) and (45), we eventually arrive at the result

$$\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}(E_\gamma = 90 \text{ MeV}) = -1.1 \times 10^{-2}(\epsilon - i4.3 \times 10^{-5} \sin \delta_{13}). \quad (46)$$

Note that an estimate of $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma} \sim 10^{-2}\epsilon$ is also reached in Ref.[12] but with a different reasoning.

We conclude that $\epsilon'_{+-\gamma}$ receives dominant contributions from $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing and the gluon penguin diagram, and its magnitude is estimated to be $10^{-2}\epsilon$ at a typical Dalitz point. Genuine direct CP violation in $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ decay originating from the electromagnetic penguin diagram is of order $10^{-4}\epsilon$. This is close to the expected lower bound of the direct CP-violating parameter ϵ' in the two pion decays of neutral kaons in the Standard Model.

Acknowledgments: The author wishes to thank Prof. C. N. Yang and the Institute for Theoretical Physics at Stony Brook for their hospitality during his stay there for sabbatical leave. This research was supported in part by the National Science Council of ROC under Contract No. NSC82-0208-M001-001Y.

REFERENCES

1. E.J. Ramberg *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2529 (1993).
2. C. Bernard, T. Draper, A. Soni, H.D. Politzer, and M. Wise, *Phys. Rev.* **D32**, 2343 (1985).
3. G. Ecker, A. Pich, and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys.* **B291**, 692 (1987); *Phys. Lett.* **B189**, 363 (1987); *Nucl. Phys.* **B303**, 665 (1988).
4. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 72 (1990).
5. C. Alliegro *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 278 (1992).
6. J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B250**, 465 (1985).
7. J. Bijnens, G. Ecker, and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett.* **B286**, 341 (1992).
8. C. Bruno and J. Prades, *Z. Phys.* **C57**, 585 (1993).
9. See, e.g., N.K. Pak and P. Rossi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B250**, 279 (1985).
10. L. Littenberg and G. Valencia, Fermilab-Pub-93/004-T (1993), to appear in *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* volume 43.
11. E.J. Ramberg *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2525 (1993).
12. Y.C.R. Lin and G. Valencia, *Phys. Rev.* **D33**, 143 (1988).
13. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B245**, 122 (1990).

14. T.D. Lee and C.S. Wu, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **16**, 511 (1967).
15. G. Costa and P.K. Kabir, *IL Nuovo Cimento*, **51A**, 564 (1967); L. Sehgal and L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev.* **162**, 1362 (1967).
16. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, S1 (1992).
17. S. Fajfer and J.-M. Gérard, *Z. Phys.* **C42**, 425 (1989); H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Rev.* **D43**, 1579 (1991).
18. L.L. Chau, *Phys. Rep.* **95**, 1 (1983).
19. T. Inami and C.S. Lim, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **65**, 297 (1981).
20. S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 657 (1976).
21. H.Y. Cheng, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7**, 1059 (1992).
22. C.O. Dib and R.D. Peccei, *Phys. Lett.* **B249**, 325 (1990).
23. J.F. Donoghue and B.R. Holstein, *Phys. Rev.* **D32**, 1152 (1985).
24. H. Georgi, *Phys. Lett.* **B298**, 187 (1993).
25. L.L. Chau and W.Y. Keung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1802 (1984).
26. H.Y. Cheng, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A4**, 495 (1989).